

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on January 9. Claims 1- 8 are currently pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 1 – 8. No new matter is introduced.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 – 8 are rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicants regards as their invention.

Regarding claims 1 – 8, the Examiner finds the term “whether or not” to be indefinite. Regarding claims 1 – 3, the Examiner finds the term “while when ...” to be confusing. Regarding claims 2 and 3, the Examiner finds the term “regarding either on” to be ambiguous.” Regarding claim 5, the Examiner finds the term “switching systems operation inherent to the system” to be unclear. Regarding claim 4, the Examiner finds the term “in the form (matrix) ...” to be unclear. Regarding claims 4 and 5, the Examiner finds insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the managed object instance”.

Applicants amend claims 1 – 8 to address each of the issues raised by the Examiner, and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 - 8, consisting of independent claims 1 – 5, and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in

condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8729
Docket No: FUJA 15.799 (100794-11120)
TJB:pm